### Theory

#### Theory is incoherent

#### 1. The ballot is always determined off abuse and inequalities, otherwise it would be impossible to evaluate the round.

#### 2. You can’t evaluate theory because it’s evaluating off the flow rather than making the decision of which is actually a better norm, so you can’t actually be consistent with the voters.

#### 3. Theory doesn’t produce the best rule since it allows the better theory debater to produce rules that will benefit them.

#### 4. Things get proven true in debate rounds all the time that aren’t true in the real world, so theory doesn't actually achieve its purpose because it doesn’t prove better norms.
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### 1

#### This world is the best of all possible worlds – modal logic proves.

Look, Brandon C., "Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2020 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2020/entries/leibniz/>. JS

Leibniz made an important contribution to the history of the ontological argument. His reflections on this form of argument go back to the 1670s, and we know that he shared his thoughts on this matter with Spinoza when Leibniz visited him on the way to Hanover. According to Leibniz, the argument that Descartes gives implicitly in the Fifth Meditation and explicitly in the First Set of Replies is faulty. Descartes had argued that God is a being having all perfections, existence is a perfection, therefore, God exists. (AT VII 118–19/CSM II 84–85) But, Leibniz thinks, one needs to show that it is possible for such a being to exist, that is, that it is possible for all perfections to co-exist in one being. If this is so, then and only then an ens perfectissimum can be said to exist. In his short essay That a Most Perfect Being Exists (Quod ens perfectissimum existit) from 1676, Leibniz argues just this. He defines a “perfection” as a “simple quality which is positive and absolute, or, which expresses without any limits whatever it does express” (A VI iii 578/SR 101). And with this definition in hand, Leibniz is then able to claim that there can be no inconsistency among perfections, since a perfection, in being simple and positive, is unanalyzable and incapable of being enclosed by limits. That is, if A and B are perfections, then the proposition “A and B are incompatible” cannot be demonstrated because A and B are simples, nor can the proposition be known per se. Therefore, it is possible that any and all perfections are in fact compatible. And, therefore, Leibniz reasons, a subject of all perfections, or an ens perfectissimum, is indeed possible.

But this argument by itself is not sufficient to determine that God necessarily exists. Leibniz must also show that existence is itself a perfection, so that a being having all perfections, an ens perfectissimum, may be said to exist. More exactly, Leibniz needs to show that necessary existence belongs to the essence of God. And this he does in another short piece from this period, writing “Again, a necessary being is the same as a being from whose essence existence follows. For a necessary being is one which necessarily exists, such that for it not to exist would imply a contradiction, and so would conflict with the concept or essence of this being” (A VI iii 583/SR 107). In other words, if it is the case that a necessary being is the same thing as a being whose existence follows from its essence, then existence must in fact be one of its essential properties. Leibniz continues in this short reflection, “And so existence belongs to its concept or essence. From this we have a splendid theorem, which is the pinnacle of modal theory and by which one moves in a wonderful way from potentiality to act: If a necessary being is possible, it follows that it exists actually, or, that such a being is actually found in the universe” (A VI iii 583/SR 107). The “pinnacle of Modal Theory” that Leibniz mentions here is none other than one of the notorious axioms of the modal logic S5: ◊□p → □p. In short, Leibniz's argument is the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| (1) | God is a being having all perfections. (Definition) |
| (2) | A perfection is a simple and absolute property. (Definition) |
| (3) | Existence is a perfection. |
| (4) | If existence is part of the essence of a thing, then it is a necessary being. |
| (5) | If it is possible for a necessary being to exist, then a necessary being does exist. |
| (6) | It is possible for a being to have all perfections. |
| (7) | (Therefore, a necessary being God) does exist. |

It should be noted that Leibniz's argument bears a certain affinity with the ontological argument that Gödel gives, insofar as it also seeks to demonstrate the possibility of a being having all simple, positive properties. (For Gödel's argument, see the entry on [ontological arguments](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ontological-arguments/).)

7.1.2 The Cosmological Argument

As we have seen, the Principle of Sufficient Reason is one of the bedrock principles of all of Leibniz's philosophy. In the Monadology, Leibniz appeals to PSR, saying that even in the case of contingent truths or truths of fact there must be a sufficient reason why they are so and not otherwise. (Monadology §36) But, since each particular truth of fact is contingent upon some other (prior) truth of fact, the reason for the entire series of truths must be located outside the series, and this ultimate reason is what we call God. (Monadology §37)

In the Theodicy, Leibniz fills out this argument with a fascinating account of the nature of God. First, insofar as the first cause of the entire series must have been able to survey all other possible worlds, it has understanding. Second, insofar as it was able to select one world among the infinity of possible worlds, it has a will. Third, insofar as it was able to bring about this world, it has power. (Leibniz adds here that “power relates to being, wisdom or understanding to truth, and will to good.”) Fourth, insofar as the first cause relates to all possibles, its understanding, will and power are infinite. And, fifth, insofar as everything is connected together, there is no reason to suppose more than one God. Thus, Leibniz is able to demonstrate the uniqueness of God, his omniscience, omnipotence, and benevolence from the twin assumptions of the contingency of the world and the Principle of Sufficient Reason. (Theodicy §7: G VI 106–07/H 127–28) Naturally, if one were deny the existence of possible worlds in the sense conceived by Leibniz or deny PSR (by, say, admitting “brute facts”), then one would hardly be moved by this kind of argument.

7.2 Optimism

Leibniz's account of the nature of possible worlds is dealt with in a separate entry. Here the following simple question will be addressed: How can this world be the best of all possible worlds? After all, as Voltaire brought out so clearly in Candide, it certainly seems that this world, in which one finds no short supply of natural and moral horrors, is far from perfect – indeed, it seems pretty lousy. Certainly only a fool could believe that it is the best world possible. But, Leibniz speaks on behalf of the fool, with an argument that has essentially the following structure:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| (1) | God is omnipotent and omniscient and benevolent and the free creator of the world. (Definition) |
| (2) | Things could have been otherwise–i.e., there are other possible worlds. (Premise) |
| (3) | Suppose this world is not the best of all possible worlds. (I.e., “The world could be better.”) |
| (4) | If this world is not the best of all possible worlds, then at least one of the following must be the case:  God was not powerful enough to bring about a better world; or  God did not know how this world would develop after his creation of it (i.e. God lacked foreknowledge); or  God did not wish this world to be the best; or  God did not create the world; or  there were no other possible worlds from which God could choose. |
| (5) | But, any one or more of the disjuncts of (4) contradicts (1) or (2). |
| (6) | Therefore, this world is the best of all possible worlds. |

#### Only necessary justification can form knowledge – anything else faces the problem of perception.

Lyons, Jack, "Epistemological Problems of Perception", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2017/entries/perception-episprob/>. JS

The skeptical scenarios (dreaming, brains in vats, differently situated sense organs, etc.) call our attention to a crucial distinction between appearance and reality: how things perceptually appear is not necessarily how things really are; things could appear the same though really be different, and they could appear to be some other, incompatible way and really be the same. Further reflection on the scenarios suggests that although I might know very little—perhaps nothing—about how things are in the external world, I can nevertheless know quite a lot about how it appears to me that things are. This engenders a shift from thinking about perceptual appearances as features of objects (e.g., “the appearance of the house was quite shabby”), to thinking of them as mental states—experiences—of the perceiving subject (e.g., “she had a visual appearance/experience as of a house”). Finally, it seems that if we are to know anything about the external world at all, that knowledge must be indirect, for what is directly before me is not the world itself, but only these perceptual appearances. I know and have justified beliefs about the external world only insofar as I know and have justified beliefs about appearances.

All this suggests a “veil of perception” between us and external objects: we do not have direct unvarnished access to the world, but instead have an access that is mediated by sensory appearances, the character of which might well depend on all kinds of factors (e.g., condition of sense organs, direct brain stimulation, etc.) besides those features of the external world that our perceptual judgments aim to capture. Paraphrasing David Hume (1739: I.2.vi, I.4.ii; 1748: sec 12.1; see also Locke 1690, Berkeley 1710, Russell 1912): nothing is ever directly present to the mind in perception except perceptual appearances.

But if our only access to the external world is mediated by potentially misleading perceptual appearances, we ought to have some assurance that the appearances we are relying on are not of the misleading variety. And here is where all the trouble arises, for it seems that there is no way we could have any evidence for the reliability of perception (i.e., perceptual appearances) without relying on other perceptions. We have empirical reason, for example, to think that science is not yet capable of stimulating brains in a very precise way, but appealing to this to rebut the possibility of brain-in-a-vat scenarios seems blatantly question begging. At the heart of the problem of the external world is a skeptical argument I will refer to as “PEW” and which I reconstruct in what follows. I have named the premises, as we will want to discuss them individually.

Nothing is ever directly present to the mind in perception except perceptual appearances. (Indirectness Principle) Thus:

Without a good reason for thinking perceptual appearances are veridical, we are not justified in our perceptual beliefs. (Metaevidential Principle)

We have no good reason for thinking perceptual appearances are veridical. (Reasons Claim)

Therefore, we are not justified in our perceptual beliefs.

A few comments on the logic of the argument are in order. [(2)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew2) and [(3)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew3) make up the meat of the argument; together they entail [(4)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew4). This means that [(1)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew1), which is motivated by the skeptical scenarios mentioned above and the associated veil of perception view, would be unnecessary for deriving the skeptical conclusion, as are those skeptical scenarios, were it not for the fact that [(1)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew1) is commonly taken to render perception inferential in such a way as to lend support to [(2)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew2). If [(1)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew1) is true, then, plausibly, [(2)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew2) is: if our access is mediated by potentially nonveridical appearances, then we should only trust the appearances we have reason to think veridical. And no other reason to endorse [(2)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew2) is immediately apparent (although an additional motivation for [(2)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew2) will be discussed below, in [section 3.1](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#ClasFoun)). [(1)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew1) is therefore an important component of the traditional problem. The plausibility of [(3)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew3) derives from the idea that our only means of verifying the veridicality of appearances would itself depend on perception, in the question-begging manner sketched above.

Notice that PEW addresses justification rather than knowledge. On the reasonable assumption that knowledge requires justification, [(4)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-episprob/#Pew4) implies that our perceptual beliefs do not count as knowledge. One who denies this assumption could easily rewrite PEW in terms of knowledge rather than justification with little or no reduction in plausibility. I have reconstructed PEW in a way that is supposed to be intuitively compelling. Were we to get specific about the implicit quantification involved (we have no good reason for thinking that any perceptual appearances are veridical? that perceptual appearances are in general veridical? that this perceptual appearance is veridical?), the argument would get a lot more complicated. The simpler version presented above is sufficient for our current purposes.

#### Knowledge requires certainty. Unger 75

Unger, Peter (1975): Ignorance (Oxford: Oxford University Press). ///AHS PB

The very particular idea that knowing entails its being all right to be certain is suggested, further, by the fact that knowing entails, at least, that one is certain. As we saw in section 9 of the preceding chapter, that this is a fact is made quite plain by the inconsistency expressed by sentences like “He really knew that it was raining, but he wasn’t absolutely certain it was” Such a sentence can express no truth: if he wasn’t certain, then he didn’t know.

### 2

#### To deny property rights is impossible – non-contradiction proves

Dominiak 17

Łukasz Dominiak (Associate Professor at Nicolaus Copernicus University in Poland; he holds a PhD and habilitation in political philosophy and is a Fellow of the Mises Institute). “Libertarianism and Original Appropriation.” Historia i Polityka, 29/2017: 22. Pp. 43-56. JDN. <https://apcz.umk.pl/HiP/article/view/HiP.2017.026/13714>

In this last paragraph we would like to focus on what we claim is the best justification for the first possession theory of **original appropriation** and what are the ramifications of both this theory and its justification. We suggest that the ultimate justification of this theory is not usually evoked avoidance of conflicts – although it is a necessary consequence of the justification we are going to present here – but **a necessary condition of rationality of a conceptual system** (it is good to remember that rights have form of deontic propositions and therefore they also form a conceptual or theoretical system). Let us present a sketch of our argument.

For a conceptual system to be rational it is necessary to be non-contradictory (Popper, 2002). Nothing that violates the law of non-contradiction can be true, justified or for that matter rational (Łukasiewicz, 1987, 1988). In a system of rationally justified rights – so-called natural rights – existence of contrary rights and duties, let alone contradictory ones is ex definitione off limits since contrary rights violate the law of non-contradiction. As Steiner puts it with reference to rights as such, although his argument seems to work impeccably only with natural rights, “mutual consistency – or compossibility – of all the rights in a proposed set of rights is at least a necessary condition of that set being possible one. A set of rights being a possible set is, I take it, itself a necessary condition of the plausibility of whatever principle of justice generates that set. Any justice principle that delivers a set of rights yielding contradictory judgements about the permissibility of a particular action either is unrealizable or (what comes to the same thing) must be modified to be realizable” (1994). Hence, systems of rights in which there are contradictory or contrary rights is off limits insofar as its rational justification is concerned. Basically, such a system can never be rationally justified. It is obvious on the other hand that one of the most important and direct ramifications of a system of non-contradictory rights is avoidance of conflicts. It is the case be-cause for a person who abides by the norms of such a system it is impossible to find himself in the situation of conflicting rights or duties. So, on our account it is not so much that property rights are justified functionally or teleologically as being conducive to conflict avoidance as that their function of conflict avoidance is a logical consequence of their fundamental vindication as rational (non-contradictory) allocations of individual jurisdictions (Barnett, 2004) or spheres of freedom (Steiner, 1994).Now the question is: What set of rights can be a set of non-contradictory rights? Following Steiner we can say that rights predicate about human action. Because each action-token always takes place in a specific time and space, it can be given an exhaustive description in extensional terms of its spatio-temporal components. We can therefore say that two action-tokens are incompossible when they share at least one physical component; on the other hand, action-tokens are com-possible when they do not have any physical components in common. Now, rights that “oblige” people to perform two or more action-tokens that share at least one physical component are perforce contradictory rights – they “oblige” people to do what is incompossible to do; whereas rights which oblige people to perform action-tokens that do not have common components are non-contradictory rights. How to make sure that rights never become contradictory? It is necessary and sufficient to construe of rights as rights to **exclusive control of physical components** of actions, i.e. As rights to possess tangible things. If physical components of actions are unequivocally distributed amongst people, if each and every physical component is unambiguously and exclusively assigned to one and only one person, then there can never be rights to action-tokens that share physical components with each other and therefore there can never be rights that oblige people to perform incompossible action-tokens (Steiner, 1994). As Steiner points out, “a set of categorically compossible domains, constituted by a set of property rights, is one in which each person’s rights are demarcated in such a way as to be mutually exclusive of every other person’s rights... we will interpret this to mean that no two persons simultaneously have rights to one and the same physical thing” (1994).

Because the nature of possession is such that it is impossible for two or more people to possess the same thing at the same time – although it seems possible for two or more people to simultaneously mix their labour with the same thing (e.g. when two people chase the same wild animal) – then **assigning rights to** people who took **first possession** of a thing, who are first-comers, perforce avoids non-contradictoriness of rights and conflicts between people since the dawn of time. For it is always and from the very beginning clear who has title to which physical resource as well as which resources are still up for appropriating and which are not so available. As Hans-Hermann Hoppe writes, “with regard to the purpose of conflict avoidance, **no alternative to private property and original appropriation exists.** In the absence of prestabilized harmony among actors, conflict can only be prevented if all goods are always in the private ownership of specific individuals and it is always clear who owns what and who does not. Also, conflicts can only be avoided from the beginning of mankind if private property is acquired by acts of original appropriation (instead of by mere declarations or words of latecomers)” (2012). It is **by definition inconceivable** for more than one person to be in a position in which it is physically possible to deal with a thing at will to the exclusion of others. Neither is it conceivable for more than one person to simultaneously come to such a position. Thus, taking first possession of scarce resources as basis of title and as principle of justice in original appropriation guarantees non-contradictoriness of rights and avoidance of conflicts since the dawn of time.

#### Logic constrains everything – every argument implicitly contains a deductive syllogism where one moves from premises to conclusions, which concedes the authority of logic.

#### Prefer on argumentation ethics – the act of engaging in discourse presupposes it

Mises Institute, "A Primer on Hoppe's Argumentation Ethics,", <https://mises.org/wire/primer-hoppes-argumentation-ethics> JS

I demonstrate that only the libertarian private property ethic can be justified argumentatively, because it is the praxeological presupposition of argumentation as such; and that any deviating, nonlibertarian ethical proposal can be shown to be in violation of this demonstrated preference. Such a proposal can be made, of course, but its propositional content would contradict the ethic for which one demonstrated a preference by virtue of one’s own act of proposition-making, i.e., by the act of engaging in argumentation as such. For instance, one can say “people are and always shall be indifferent towards doing things,” but this proposition would be belied by the very act of proposition-making, which in fact would demonstrate subjective preference (of saying this rather than saying something else or not saying anything at all). Likewise, nonlibertarian ethical proposals are falsified by the reality of actually proposing them.

To reach this conclusion and to properly understand its importance and logical force, two insights are essential.

First, it must be noted that the question of what is just or unjust — or for that matter the even more general question of what is a valid proposition and what is not — only arises insofar as I am, and others are, capable of propositional exchanges, i.e., of argumentation. The question does not arise vis-à-vis a stone or fish because they are incapable of engaging in such exchanges and of producing validity claiming propositions. Yet if this is so — and one cannot deny that it is without contradicting oneself, as one cannot argue the case that one cannot argue — then any ethical proposal as well as any other proposition must be assumed to claim that it is capable of being validated by propositional or argumentative means. (Mises, too, insofar as he formulates economic propositions, must be assumed to claim this.) In fact, in producing any proposition, overtly or as an internal thought, one demonstrates one’s preference for the willingness to rely on argumentative means in convincing oneself or others of something. There is then, trivially enough, no way of justifying anything unless it is a justification by means of propositional exchanges and arguments. However, then it must be considered the ultimate defeat for an ethical proposal if one can demonstrate that its content is logically incompatible with the proponent’s claim that its validity be ascertainable by argumentative means. To demonstrate any such incompatibility would amount to an impossibility proof, and such proof would constitute the most deadly defeat possible in the realm of intellectual inquiry.

Second, it must be noted that argumentation does not consist of free-floating propositions but is a form of action requiring the employment of scarce means; and that the means which a person demonstrates as preferring by engaging in propositional exchanges are those of private property. For one thing, no one could possibly propose anything, and no one could become convinced of any proposition by argumentative means, if a person’s right to make exclusive use of his [their] physical body were not already presupposed. It is this recognition of each other’s mutually exclusive control over one’s own body which explains the distinctive character of propositional exchanges that, while one may disagree about what has been said, it is still possible to agree at least on the fact that there is disagreement. It is also obvious that such a property right to one’s own body must be said to be justified a priori, for anyone who tried to justify any norm whatsoever would already have to presuppose the exclusive right of control over his body as a valid norm simply in order to say, “I propose such and such.” Anyone disputing such a right would become caught up in a practical contradiction since arguing so would already imply acceptance of the very norm which he was disputing.

Furthermore, it would be equally impossible to sustain argumentation for any length of time and rely on the propositional force of one’s arguments if one were not allowed to appropriate in addition to one’s body other scarce means through homesteading action (by putting them to use before somebody else does), and if such means and the rights of exclusive control regarding them were not defined in objective physical terms. For if no one had the right to control anything at all except his own body, then we would all cease to exist and the problem of justifying norms simply would not exist. Thus, by virtue of the fact of being alive, property rights to other things must be presupposed to be valid. No one who is alive could argue otherwise.

#### Initial acquisition can never be unjust.

Feser, E. (2005). THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION. Social Philosophy and Policy, 22(1), 56–80. doi:10.1017/s0265052505041038 JS

The reason there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources. The concept of justice, that is to say, simply does not apply to initial acquisition. It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place. In particular, it applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that external resources are initially unowned. Consider the following example. Suppose an individual A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R. For it to be the case that A commits an injustice in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that there is some individual B (or perhaps a group of individuals) against whom A commits the injustice. But for B to have been wronged by A’s acquisition of R, B would have to have had a rightful claim over R, a right to R. By hypothesis, however, B did not have a right to R, because no one had a right to it—it was unowned, after all. So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, the very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R. Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. The same thing, by extension, will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after someone has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer. It is impossible, then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.

#### That negates – space is not under ownership by any state now, which proves that acquisition cannot be unjust. Furthermore, if we prove there is a right to appropriate on Earth, then logically there is a right to appropriate in outer space since there is no non-arbitrary difference between the two domains.

## Case